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POINTS TO PONDER

1. Should RMR LSPs be full rings?
2. The issue of “half-rings”
3. What else should be addressed?
RMR LSPS

RMR LSPs, as defined, are ring LSPs – they start and end on the same node

- This is a (non-trivial) implementation challenge
- In both LDP and RSVP-TE, this requires defeating the checks that the LSP doesn’t form a loop (!)

However, from an aesthetic point of view, this is clean

- From an implementation point of view, this is easier (once you’ve gotten past the “this is a loop” check)

So, our inclination is to keep it this way

- Does the WG agree? (Speak now, or forever hold your tongue!)
The green LSP is the current proposal. It’s a full ring LSP, starting and ending on node 1.

The red LSP is an LSP that egresses on node 1, but starts on node 2.

In conjunction with the blue LSP starting on node 0 and ending on node 1, these form the counter-rotating LSP pair that is the ring LSP egressing on node 1.

To build this LSP pair requires a fair amount of signaling between node 1 and node 2, and node 1 and node 0. This introduces a fair amount of code complexity.
ADVANTAGES OF A FULL RING LSP

A full ring LSP has the further advantage of simple end-to-end OAM: node 1 periodically sends an LSP ping message to itself. As long as it receives these messages, it’s happy – the end-to-end LSP is working.
What if the ring is not complete? Some SPs prefer not to have a link from node 0 to node 1. (It is hard to see how this achieves a ring with protection ... what if the link between node 3 and node 4 breaks?) Nonetheless, this is a possible scenario. We are considering a few solutions. Suggestions are welcome!
WHAT ELSE SHOULD BE ADDRESSED?

Our deliberations have been quite far-ranging

If you have thought of any other scenarios, or other issues not considered heretofore, please contact the authors or bring it to the list

- Barring any such considerations, we will propose a WG LC at the next IETF